

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-17 and 20-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, new claims 23-30 are added.

The Advisory Action dated June 14, 2005 indicates that the amendments filed on June 1, 2005 require further search and/or consideration because the limitation “such that the internal user is permitted to connect to the server without access control” is a new claim limitation. During a July 13 telephone conference between Examiner Shiferaw and applicant’s undersigned representative, Mr. Oren, Examiner Shiferaw indicated that the June 1 Amendment was denied entry because it raises new issues (as stated on page 2 of the Advisory Action).

The outstanding Office Action rejects claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,604,143 to Nagar et al. (hereafter Nagar) in view of U.S. Patent 6,061,798 to Coley et al. (hereafter Coley). The Office Action also rejects claims 5-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Coley in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0020242 to Gupta et al. (hereafter Gupta) and further in view of Nagar. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant maintains all of the arguments set forth in the Response filed June 1, 2005. As a summary, the Response indicates that features recited in independent claims 1, 5 and 14 related to features previously recited in dependent claims 8, 9, 18 and 19. When rejecting previous dependent claim 8, the Office Action (and the Advisory Action) cited Coley’s column 6, lines 7-43 and Figure 4b, element 403 as corresponding to features relating to the access control is not performed if the ID transmitted from the internal user is “Anonymous.” However, this section of Coley clearly does not relate to an internal user having an ID of “Anonymous.” While this

section may discuss the proxy agent performing verification checks such as described in column 6, lines 35-42, this does not suggest any features relating to an ID of “Anonymous.” There is no suggestion in Coley (or the other applied references) that access control is not performed if the ID transmitted from the internal user is “Anonymous.” Furthermore, there is no suggestion in Coley (or the other applied references) where access control is not performed if the ID transmitted from the internal user is “Anonymous” such that the internal user is permitted to connect to the server without access control. Coley’s column 6, lines 7-43 merely relates to the access/denial of access. There is no suggestion for the ID transmitted from the internal user is “Anonymous” and/or permitting the internal user to connect to the server without access control.

Independent claim 1 also recites that if the user ID is “Anonymous,” interrupting the transmission of the received service command to the external network. The Office Action also appears to rely on Coley’s column 6, lines 7-23 for these features. However, these features clearly do not relate to a user ID being “Anonymous.”

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the claimed features. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the other independent claims 5 and 14 define patentable subject matter at least for similar reasons.

New independent claim 23 also defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 23 recites allowing the internal user to connect to a server of the external network when an ID of the internal user is “Anonymous,” after allowing the internal user to connect to the server, denying transmission of the data when the ID of the

internal user is “Anonymous” and transmitting data received from the internal user to the external network when the ID of the internal user is other than “Anonymous.” For at similar reasons as set forth above, Coley and the other applied references do not teach or suggest allowing an internal user to connect to a server when an ID of the internal user is “Anonymous” as well as denying transmission of the data when the ID of the internal user is “Anonymous” (after allowing the internal user to connect to the server). Accordingly, independent claim 23 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims also recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7, 10-17 and 20-30 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, David C. Oren, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/891,300
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

Docket No. P-0213

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: August 3, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610